DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 383 HE 019 903

AUTHOR Gaudiani, Claire L.; Burnett, David G.
TITLE Academic Alliances: A New Approach to School/College Collaboration.
INSTITUTION American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 36p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20036 ($5.00, prepaid; 25% discount for 25 or more copies).
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
JOURNAL CIT Current Issues in Higher Education; n1 1985/86

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Curriculum; *College Faculty; *College School Cooperation; Cooperative Programs; Educational Cooperation; Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; *Intellectual Disciplines; Interprofessional Relationship; Interschool Communication; *Professional Development; Secondary Education; Secondary School Curriculum; *Secondary School Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Academic Alliances

ABSTRACT

Academic alliances between secondary school teachers and postsecondary faculty are discussed. Teachers and faculty who teach the same subject in the same geographical area voluntarily meet regularly to examine the quality of teaching and learning in their discipline at the local level. School and college faculty together develop some common ground between the demands of the specialist and the generalist and maintain an appreciation of both the teaching and research effort. Participating staff can use academic alliances to avoid getting stuck in dull career paths and to develop new leadership opportunities. In addition to identifying interested faculty, a steering committee should be developed. Meetings of the alliance group can be devoted to journal review, panel discussions, demonstration classes and curriculum exchanges, and review of major conferences. Incentives for faculty participation can include released time, inservice/graduate credit, pay, and credit toward tenure and promotion. Education and continuing education departments can assist postsecondary educators in starting and sustaining collaboration. Descriptions of alliances are provided for foreign languages and literature, history, international studies, geography, English, and science and math. Information on five funding sources is included. (SW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

CURRENT ISSUES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

1988 86 • Number 2

AAHE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

$5.00

ED276383

# ACADEMIC ALLIANCES

## A New Approach to School/College Collaboration

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

by
Claire L. Gaudiani
and
David G. Burnett

2

CURRENT ISSUES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

1985/86

AAHE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Number 1

**by**
**Claire L. Gaudiani**
**and**
**David G. Burnett**

**With a Preface by**
**Marc Tucker**

## About the Authors

Claire Gaudiani is director of the Exxon Education Foundation-funded Academic Alliances Project at the University of Pennsylvania. She also is senior fellow in the University's Department of Romance Languages and assistant director of the Joseph H. Lauder Institute for Management and International Studies.

David Burnett is associate professor of romance languages and associate dean of the School of Arts and Sciences at the University of Pennsylvania. He directs the Lifelong Education Division of the School, which includes the University's professional development programs for educators at secondary and postsecondary institutions.

## About Current Issues in Higher Education

*Current Issues in Higher Education* monographs are published on an occasional basis.

In previous years, the series was built exclusively around papers delivered at AAHE's National Conferences on Higher Education. This particular issue is an outgrowth of activities at the 1984 conference, which focused on high school/college partnerships.

AAHE would like to thank the ARCO Foundation for its generous support of this project.

## About AAHE

The American Association for Higher Education is a national organization of individuals joined in two related purposes: to advance the quality of American higher education and their own effectiveness as teachers, learners, and managers.

AAHE is a forum for civilized, constructive debate. It has no partisan agenda or group to represent. Issues are identified, subjected to analysis, and presented for choices.

Through AAHE, members receive a constant stream of information about issues — current and emergent — via publications, special projects and convenings, and through our National Conference on Higher Education. For membership information, write or call: AAHE, One Dupont Circle, Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20036, 202/293-6440.


## 1986-87 Board of Directors

*Chair*
Joseph F. Kauffman
University of Wisconsin
Madison

*Chair-Elect*
Adele S. Simmons
Hampshire College

*Vice Chair*
Reatha Clark King
Metropolitan State University

*Past Chair*
Harriet W. Sheridan
Brown University

Estela M. Bensimon
Teachers College
Columbia University

Anne L. Bryant
American Association of
University Women

Alfredo G. de los Santos, Jr.
Maricopa County Community College
District

Donald L. Fruehling
McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Ellen V. Futter
Barnard College

Jerry G. Gaff
Hamline University

Zelda F. Gamson
University of Michigan

Stephen R. Graubard
*Daedalus*

Joseph Katz
State University of New York
at Stony Brook

Arthur E. Levine
Bradford College

Frank Newman
Education Commission
of the States

Alan Pifer
Carnegie Corporation
of New York

W. Ann Reynolds
The California State
University

Piedad F. Robertson
Miami-Dade Community
College

D. Wayne Silby
Groupware Systems

P. Michael Timpane
Teachers College
Columbia University

*President:* Russell Edgerton
*Vice President:* Theodore J. Marchese
*Managing Editor:* Jann Teeple-Hewes

# Contents


Preface by Marc Tucker ..... v

Foreword ..... vii

Academic Alliances: An Introduction ..... 1

A Brief History: Connections That Did Not Get Made ..... 3

Communities of Inquiry ..... 5

Establishing an Alliance: From Theory to Practice ..... 9

Incentives ..... 13
- Building Incentives for Faculty ..... 13
- Institutional Incentives ..... 14

Contributors to Collaboration ..... 17

Privilege or Responsibility: Building a New Tradition ..... 19

Appendix A — Alliances in the Disciplines:
- Alliances in Foreign Languages and Literatures ..... 21
- Alliances in History ..... 22
- Alliances in International Studies ..... 23
- Alliances in Geography ..... 24
- Alliances in English ..... 24
- Alliances in Science and Math ..... 25

Appendix B — Fiscal Resources ..... 29

Appendix C — Bibliography ..... 31

# Preface

Many years ago, I had the privilege of playing a minor role in the work of the Physical Science Study Committee, originator of PSSC physics, one of the most famous science curriculum reform efforts sponsored by the National Science Foundation in the 1950s and 60s. What attracted the attention of the world was the dazzling array of leading scientists involved in this effort to recast high school science. What fascinated me was a little known adjunct to the program.

As interest in PSSC spread among high school physics teachers, the question arose as to how to sustain the renewed excitement of the teachers in the subject they taught. What evolved was a modest effort to connect these school teachers with their college and university counterparts in Saturday sessions devoted to new topics in physics and the teaching of physics.

I discovered that the teachers involved often drove more than 100 miles in each direction to attend these gatherings, without, as I recall, any monetary reimbursement whatsoever. Their hunger for participation in the professional world of physics and physics teaching was that great.

Talking to the participants revealed more — surprise on the part of the postsecondary faculty at the richness of the rewards they derived from these exchanges with their high school colleagues; and frustration felt by the school teachers at a career in which everyone around had always presumed that their professional interest was in teaching, not physics.

The ultimate, and inevitable, fate of the science and mathematics reform movement was very disappointing to its prime movers. Its essential conception was that brilliant university scholars would create a product for school teachers to use.

In time, we will, I trust, return to a focus on the curriculum. When we do, I hope we will have learned that real, lasting curriculum reform will emerge only from a genuine partnership between school professionals and postsecondary professionals, acting as genuine colleagues.

The PSSC experiment, with little networks of people who shared an interest in physics and the teaching of physics, failed because there was little else in the environment of most school teachers, then or now, that supported a truly professional role for them.

Moves are now afoot in state capitals across the country that may change all that. Policy alone, however, can only set the stage. In the end, we will know that school teachers regard themselves and are regarded by others as true professionals when, among other things, they are everywhere working with those in higher education who teach the same subjects they do — as real colleagues.

In the following pages, Claire Gaudiani and David Burnett describe a movement that is designed to have precisely this outcome. Much depends on its success.

**Marc Tucker**
Executive Director
Carnegie Forum on Education
and the Economy

# Foreword

AAHE has long supported collaboration between schools and colleges as one of the keys to educational reform at both levels. At the 1981 National Conference, Ernest Boyer and others spoke of the need to develop new partnerships with high schools. That same year, we published a *Current Issues in Higher Education* monograph entitled "High School/College Partnerships" featuring articles by Ernest Boyer, Michael O'Keefe and others. And at our 1984 National Conference, "Schools and Colleges: Toward Higher Performance," we sponsored 17 sessions and workshops on this important issue, honored four exemplary programs, and published a descriptive directory of national, regional, and local collaboratives.

It was at the 1984 conference that we became aware of Claire Gaudiani's work in establishing the Academic Alliance movement. Modeled on the concept of the county medical society and county bar association, the Alliance groups create local communities of scholar/teachers that meet monthly and take responsibility for their own professional development and for the quality of teaching and learning in their disciplines. Working initially with foreign language and literature faculty, the movement has grown to include 150 sites in 45 states and over 5,000 faculty members in a variety of disciplines.

Academic Alliances differ from other collaboratives because they originate and are sustained by the voluntary efforts of faculty in a local area, not from "top-down" inter-institutional arrangements. Many such arrangements do feature faculty collaboration—in curriculum development, in student placement and teaching, and in professional development and training programs. And, to the extent that these other involvements impact faculty motivation and the way faculty think of themselves as professionals, they share a great deal with the Alliances. But, these efforts often focus on a single project, with faculty interaction limited to work on that project. When the project is over, the collaboration comes to an end.

The Alliances are not a substitute for other forms of collaboration. In fact, they can and do coexist with the other important inter-institutional efforts. What stands out about the Alliances is the renewed sense of identity, motivation, and empowerment reported by participating faculty.

For this reason, we wanted the larger educational community to know more about this important model of faculty professionalism. So, in 1985, with generous support from the ARCO Foundation, we asked Claire Gaudiani and David Burnett to help us tell the story. This *Current Issues in Higher Education* monograph is one part of a dissemination effort that includes networking at the AAHE National Conference on Higher Education, presentations at other professional meetings, and audioconferences.

**—Louis S. Albert**
Director of Professional Services
AAHE

# Academic Alliances:
# An Introduction

American society is undergoing a major restructuring. Whole forests of trees are falling into pulp mills to produce the paperbacks in which new Gibbons describe the *Rise and Fall of the Industrial Empire*. The "Industrial Society" has matured into the "Information Society" of shifting roles and interlocking networks. Domestic issues now require a global perspective. Technology is an integral part of the decision-making process in every field. The challenges of an information-oriented society bear on all American institutions, especially education.

The principal response to date has been a search for new, flexible institutional structures. For example, John Naisbitt predicts that authoritarian, hierarchical patterns of organization will give way to more efficient, flexible collaborative networks (Naisbitt, pp. 1-36). The variety and complexity of skills needed to achieve good results suggests increased respect and collegiality among a range of personnel rather than the "superior" vs. "inferior" relationships that currently organize most work places. The old "either-or" mentality will cede to one that encourages a variety of options. Management ownership is projected to diminish while shared ownership schemas become more popular. Naisbitt goes on to predict that conflict resolution will increasingly evolve toward a "win-win" strategy rather that the older "win-lose" approach. Most important — the competitive edge will result from creativity. Creativity depends on an institution's capacity to hire imaginative individuals and to develop a stimulating, nourishing work environment.

In American education, the demands of the Information Society require new structures as well, ones that will encourage diversification, creativity, and collegiality among teaching personnel. In these pages, we wish to advocate one such structure: the academic alliance.

In this distinctively academic concept, secondary school and postsecondary faculty who teach the same subject in the same geographical area meet regularly. These voluntary alliances of working professionals examine the quality of teaching and learning in their discipline at the local level. We call these alliances "local communities of inquiry in the disciplines."

**The demands of the Information Society require new structures that will encourage diversification, creativity, and collegiality among teaching personnel.**

These communities contain many of the features of the reconceptualized corporate workplace. They move away from the traditional hierarchy that has always separated school and college faculty — a hierarchy that values teachers in inverse proportion to the age of the students they teach. Instead, these new structures create collegiality and mutual respect borne out of the experience of working together as adults from different but mutually dependent sectors of a common enterprise.

- A focus on inquiry enables school and college faculty to find common ground, to escape the "either-or" trap that has traditionally held "teachers" and "researchers" in separate camps.
- If faculty governance is becoming obsolete in the complex, fragmented institutional settings of most schools and colleges, the faculty in

local communities of inquiry can retain ownership of the academic disciplines, their future research directions, the pedagogies that nurture them, the definitions of quality practice, and of malpractice.

- Faculty in communities of inquiry in their discipline foster a sense of shared ownership of the academic disciplines among local school and college faculty. Rather than settling for the older "parachute drop" in-service or faculty development programs planned and presented by "others," faculty in collaborative groups provide their own "sweat-equity" in the construction of opportunities for ongoing learning in their field.

**Academic Alliances move away from the traditional hierarchy that values teachers in inverse proportion to the age of the students they teach.**

This new faculty profile thrives on creativity. School and college faculty in collaborative groups stimulate each other to think in new ways about teaching and learning in their academic fields. Their energy and mutual respect create a different environment for the academic profession — one that attracts bright young people, and inspires mid- and late-career professionals in other sectors to move into education.

The creation of local communities of inquiry ach of the major academic disciplines is an idea whose time has come in the United States. In the following pages, we will provide the definition, history, philosophy, and recent manifestations of the new faculty profile.

Currently, thousands of school and college teachers are meeting together monthly or bi-monthly in communities of inquiry in their disciplines. They are reinventing academic life for each other. As we explore this phenomenon and its implications for American education, it becomes clear that our greatest natural resource for the Information Age is the quality of mind of the people who teach in our schools and colleges.

# A Brief History:

# Connections That Did Not Get Made

In the proceedings of the 1894 National Education Association (NEA) meeting, Ida B. Haslop, principal of the High School of Pueblo, Colorado, addressed the topic "How May a Professional Spirit be Acquired by the Secondary Teachers of America?" She said: "The academic requirements of a teacher should be raised. The standard all along the line should be advanced. More thorough scholarship, broader experience, and better disciplined minds should be required of those who demand certificates to teach..."

She called for organizations of teachers that would be: "something like district meetings for which programs could be arranged with papers or round table discussions of problems of special interest to secondary teachers...If each one of us could carry home with us an enthusiasm...and use it as a coal to kindle a little fire...we might have sufficient blaze to warm our own finger tips, and, perhaps, spare a little brand with which to scorch into activity some poor old college professor, who has been hibernating for the last decade, and who, by the way, is partly responsible for our dormant condition."

In the discussion that followed her talk, L.C. Hall of New Jersey remarked: "A more vigorous and general attempt should be made to affiliate public high schools with higher education and strive to do such work in quantity and quality as will meet the requirements of the related colleges. Teachers so possessed of responsibility will grow of necessity." (NEA Addresses; 1894 Proceedings vol. 33.)

C.C. Ramsay of Fall River, Massachusetts followed by noting that "Colleges are in many places doing poorer work in teaching than in high schools," and called on more teachers to attend professional gatherings. The NEA, having by then an elementary, secondary, and higher education department, at least offered teachers and professors the chance to address important issues. Miss Haslop called for discipline-specific district meetings; her colleague Hall called for affiliations of school and college teachers.

**The AMA and ABA organized doctors and lawyers into associations that assured a general upgrading in knowledge and skills and created a more unified and respected professional profile for both groups in American society.**

By 1894, the American Medical Association (AMA) and American Bar Association (ABA) had already organized doctors and lawyers into national, state, and county associations similar to the ones Haslop and Hall suggested for teachers. These groups helped shape the professional profile of doctors and lawyers. They helped determine good and bad practice, defined educational expectations, both pre- and in-service. They linked country doctors or lawyers with a single degree to the research-oriented professionals with several degrees. These links helped assure a general upgrading in knowledge and skills and created a more unified and respected professional profile for both groups in American society.

In the same period, the Modern Language Association (MLA), American Historical Association (AHA), and other national societies of academic professionals were also founded. However, unlike the national associations in medicine and law, local or county-level affiliations of school and col-

lege teachers did not develop. There were obvious reasons.

Seventy percent of the secondary teachers were women while only twenty percent of the college faculty were women. There were many fewer colleges and universities (about 900 nationally) compared to the number of schools; thus, the notion of local cooperation would have made sense only in the few locations where postsecondary institutions existed. The faculty at the two levels also shared a minuscule number of students in common. Only one and one half percent of the total enrollments in K-16 in 1890 were in grades 13-16 (statistics from *The Condition of Education*).

Additionally, by the turn of the century, secondary teachers had the industrial workers' organizational model — the union — to consider, rather than the model offered by the learned societies. In her address, "Why Teachers Should Organize," presented at the 1904 NEA meeting, Margaret Haley outlined how unionization of teachers would assure basic rights and working conditions. The fledgling notion of district-based professional affiliations of school and college teachers took a back seat to this other organizational structure.

**By the turn of the century, secondary teachers had the industrial workers' organizational model — the union — to consider, rather than the model offered by the learned societies.**

Out of the diverging histories of school and college faculty arose a wide variety of myths and presumptions that have worked against collaboration since the turn of the century. "Teachers teach students and faculty teach subjects." "All college faculty are scholars who live in an ivory tower surrounded by a threat of 'publish or perish.' " "High school teachers have baccalaureate degrees and professors have Ph.D.'s." And so on. Yet many of these preconceptions and prior historical circumstances are no longer relevant today. By 1980, fifty percent of high school teachers had a Master's degree. The number of women teaching in higher education has increased from twenty-five percent to thirty percent of the total population in the last 70 years. Most importantly, teaching colleagues share more "turf" and more students than ever before. There are 3,000 colleges and universities today with 1.2 million faculty members, as compared with only 20,000 at the turn of the century. These professors are teaching 12.4 million college students, almost equal the number (13.8 million) of high school students in the country. As recently as 1950, there were five times as many high school students enrolled as there were college students.

Along with a shared population has come a shared work profile, more hours in the classroom, and more remedial classes in both colleges and schools. Far from living in an ivory tower, today's college professors rarely publish (fewer than 40 percent have published anything in the last two years). Most worry, instead, about teaching an ever more heterogeneous group of students, perhaps in the evening, the summer, and on or off the campus. Today, unionized school faculty have unionized colleagues at the postsecondary level. Some twenty-five percent of college professors are now covered by collective bargaining agreements (Keller, p.36).

# Communities of Inquiry

Increases in the number and proximity of secondary and postsecondary educators make local collaboration a practical possibility today. The increasing number of shared students creates mutual problems and needs for faculty at both levels. Yet it would be silly to assert that common ground between faculty at the two levels is self-evident or easy to establish. Great differences in institutional cultures remain and may often obscure the fundamental shared concerns of committed faculty.

In *Habits of the Heart*, Robert Bellah analyzes the fragmentation of society into what he calls "the culture of separation." This is evident in academic life where primary, middle, and high school teachers have felt separated from each other and light years distant from college faculty. It is also evident in college faculty "turf" struggles and in the tensions engendered by a "research vs. teaching" mentality. The lack of consensus over what is good pedagogy, course content, curriculum design, and administrative support is a further manifestation. In his prescription for all sectors of American society, Bellah calls for a "new level of social integration."

> [This] would allow us to link interests with a conception of the common good. With a more explicit understanding of what we have in common and the goals we seek to attain together, the differences between us that remain would be less threatening...reward [would be] the approbation of one's fellows more than the accumulation of ... wealth ... It would become part of the ethos of work to be aware of our intricate connectedness and interdependence.

Communities of inquiry in the disciplines provide excellent opportunities for the academic sector to begin at the local level to develop consensus and recognize interdependence. These groups help faculty structure consensus from the fragmentation that is hurting American education. How can any consensus be approached unless it emanates from the faculty supported by administrators? No amount of money to support education helps if fragmentation persists. How efficiently and meaningfully collaboration can be pursued is evident in the work of currently operating alliance groups.

**Communities of inquiry in the disciplines provide excellent opportunities for the academic sector to begin at the local level to develop consensus and recognize interdependence.**

Why focus on the disciplines? Disciplines provide the best opportunity to look for common ground between school and college faculty. Academic alliances result from a simple concept: adults who teach the same subject in the same geographic area share a collective responsibility for the quality of each other's teaching and learning. This responsibility for good practice expresses itself in collegial meetings and in sustained commitments to each other's continuing inquiry in the discipline. Faculty keep each other up-to-date on major issues and publications in the field. The academic disciplines offer the most convenient starting point for those who teach students of different ages to find common interests and undertake work related to, but not bound by, the classroom. Without a shared life of the mind, neither sector can maintain a fully defined professional identity, since the enterprise of education is dependent on continuity of learning from early childhood through adult years.

Why focus on inquiry?

In her work, *Paradoxes of Education in a Republic*, Eva Brann argues that the traditional dichotomy between teaching and research in post-secondary education is not worth arguing about at all. Neither von Humboldt's vision of the university in "isolation and freedom" pursuing "investigation and research," nor Newman's idea of a university as a place for teaching universal knowledge, rather that a place to advance it, is particularly useful to students. She opts, instead, for "inquiry," the nurturing of intentional awareness of what one says and thinks. Among the characteristics of this idea is that the knowledge or focus of inquiry may be old or new. One can, and in fact, should, *rethink things* rather than strive only to *think new things*.

> Inquiry...denotes questing, questioning, question-asking. It suggests intensity. It connotes a searching into things and a seeking out of truth. It intimates both the dis-ease of doubt and a trust in the possibility of satisfaction. (Brann, p. 142)

**Academic alliances result from a simple concept: adults who teach the same subject in the same geographic area share a collective responsibility for the quality of each other's teaching and learning.**

The idea of inquiry thus defined places great emphasis on the self and self awareness. Unfortunately, the fragile balance of conscious knowledge acquisition and dissemination implied in "inquiry" has largely been replaced by rigid role playing. The educational enterprise has sorted out teaching (read "training" all too often) and research ("my work") by institution and age level. The result is prejudice and mistrust that breed bureaucratic ossification. The older the students (up to a point), the more dignified and exalted the work. The more "advanced" the level of instruction, the more important the professor/teacher. In a society that honors "experts" above all else - how could it be otherwise? Even in fields where the "hierarchy" of knowledge from elementary to advanced no longer matches up with institutional categories, the instructional corps has remained segregated according to level of institutional affiliation. Brann recalls the mission of the teaching profession: to impart the skills and knowledge necessary for citizens to engage in inquiry. Faculty cannot really achieve this mission unless they themselves are so engaged and unless they lead a life of the mind related to the subjects they teach to students.

The culture and professional demands of school teaching tend to encourage a generalist knowledge of the discipline, while the culture and demands on college teaching reward specialization. When they work together regularly as a community of inquiry sharing a common academic discipline, school and college faculty begin to share some elements of each others' cultures. College faculty forced to pull out of the specialized tracks where they spend a great deal of their energy and time are able to re-examine the major outlines, suppositions, and dimensions of their field. School teachers who spend their time describing the field from the perspective of high altitude aerial photographers are forced to land and explore a small piece of territory. School and college faculty together develop some balance, some common ground, between the demands of the specialist and the generalist and maintain an appreciation of each kind of knowledge in the teaching and research effort.

### Impact on Faculty

Alliances focus on faculty instead of students, curriculum, or programs. They aim to affect the quality of adult professional experience. Rather than defining teachers by their "output" in the classroom, alliances encourage faculty to expand their knowledge of their academic field in ways they find personally satisfying.

Academic alliances change the shape of work in the teaching profession. School and college faculty can use these local organizations to avoid getting stuck in dull career paths and to develop new leadership opportunities. Rosabeth Moss Kanter suggests that three criteria characterize jobs that help people develop leadership and gain power:

- opportunities to exercise discretion and innovation
- activities to bring people visibility for their achievements
- relevance of the person's work to important problems in the organization or field

Academic alliances offer faculty ways to achieve power without leaving the classroom for administration (the common track to leadership roles) or other careers. Local alliance members design and direct the group's substantive activities. Some faculty have rediscovered the energy of their early teaching years through the renewed sense of

mission that their leadership role in the local alliance offers. In one state, colleagues told us, "Tom is a new man." They explained that when Tom took charge of recruiting community leaders for an alliance advisory board, he went to speak to state legislators and members of the state humanities commission. In articulating to these professionals the importance of the subject area he teaches, Tom reconvinced himself of the importance of his own work in the classroom and of his colleagues' work in the department. He is not "dead wood" anymore.

Alliances give individual faculty visibility and recognition within their own institutions and in the community. Some groups arrange newspaper coverage of alliance meetings. Some groups have published recommendations for improvements in teaching and learning in their academic field. Others have advised state legislatures on the needs of teachers in their discipline. Another important task has been to assist administrators in avoiding "malpractice" in the design of teaching assignments and learning conditions, such as student class size, lab needs, and faculty development opportunities. These activities bring collaborating faculty members the visibility that suggests they have power and merit respect beyond the confines of the classrooms in which they teach. Practicing in public as colleagues with a common responsibility for their subject area, faculty leave behind the older, negative public images of the ivory tower and the picket line.

Finally, unlike activities that give faculty a sense of power, but distract them from their academic responsibilities, alliances are centrally relevant to the important issues and problems in their field. Alliance members gain initial exposure to new areas in their field. Language and literature faculty have learned together, for instance, about the impact of new technologies on their discipline and subsequently have used computer-assisted instruction and computer-based textual analysis in research and teaching. Alliances offer ways for faculty to re-engage, to put their life's work to the benefit of others, especially other adults — teachers, administrators, and opinion makers. Re-engaged teachers see that change is possible and are less likely to block committee work or resist innovation. Their professional relationships with colleagues and administrators reflect their heightened sense of self-esteem and empowerment.

## Distinguishing Alliances from Institutional Partnerships

In his important monograph, *School and College*, Gene Maeroff describes several successful school/college partnerships which, through intra-institutional cooperation, link programs, curricula, and other institutional agendas. The projects he highlights are aimed at affecting students' experience in school through enrichment and acceleration in their programs of study. In contrast with the academic alliances model, these partnerships are institutional rather than interpersonal and focus on the quality of student life rather than the quality of the faculty's professional life.

Maeroff suggests five principles for success in school/college partnerships, each of which reveals an important element of the academic alliance concept.

**The culture and demands of school teaching encourage a generalist knowledge of the discipline, while the culture and demands of college teaching reward specialization.**

**1. People involved in partnerships must discover that there are messages to send, that there is something common to talk about.**

In school/college faculty alliances, the messages to send concern major issues in the disciplines as they are shared by the adults in that academic area. The initial work of the group members is to search and discover "common ground." Often faculty begin this task by describing the curricula they teach and exchanging course outlines and reading lists. But it takes time for school and college faculty to discover common ground and topics for exploration may or may not be related to the immediate demands of the curricula they teach. For science faculty in alliances, common ground has spatial as well as intellectual implications; science alliances often meet in members' labs.

**2. The traditional "pecking order" must be dumped: or, it's time to "get off the bus."**

The academic alliances model articulates this principle by challenging school and college faculty to meet each other as colleagues with many common and complementary interests and experiences despite obvious differences. The alliance model recognizes that school and college teachers travel through their subject area on different kinds of buses. The school bus, with its younger passengers, follows a certain route proceeding at a certain speed and making certain stops. The college/university

bus, taking its passengers through the academic field, follows different pathways at different speeds and makes different stops. These institutional differences have tended to block the faculty aboard each bus from finding each other. Alliances arrange a common time each month when faculty *get off their buses*, and go to the park — the common ground — where they meet each other to reflect on the field from an adult perspective. Once on common ground, it becomes less significant which bus a teacher came on, and more significant what contribution he or she can make to the community of inquiry in the discipline.

**3. Good partnerships focus sharply on a problem that needs to be solved such as lowering student dropout rates or increasing minority students' math/science skills.**

The alliance model partially diverges from this principle. Alliances are designed to engage faculty in *sustained* professional relationships to enhance their intellectual growth. Group members' commitment to the subject they teach is the basis of their collaboration. While a single topic might galvanize group members' attention initially, single "problems," whether intellectual, pedagogical, or social, do not sustain long term commitments. As progress is made on "problems," or conversely, as solutions prove elusive, faculty need to feel free to move on together as a community of inquiry to address new topics. On the other hand, institutional partnerships with permanent administrative staffs and significant budgets may well be needed to resolve intractable educational problems like high drop out rates.

**4. Rewards are needed to sustain school/college partnerships.**

The five year history of about 150 alliance groups suggests that participation works best when attendance is voluntary and rewards are personal. Faculty members in alliance groups report that they receive personal rewards like increased self-esteem, a heightened sense of professional engagement, and greater respect from administrators, school board members, parents, and colleagues. Ultimately, as more faculty engage in voluntary communities of inquiry, it will be possible to change the way American society values its teachers and rewards their contributions to life in the United States. But, increased self-esteem among its own membership within the academic profession must precede outside recognition.

The faculty in existing alliance groups have written proposals and received grants to carry on special activities recognized as significant to group members. Large foundations like the Exxon Education Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation, and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) supported the original national dissemination project but no faculty have ever been compensated to participate in alliances. Subsequently, the NEH designed a school/college collaborative project category and smaller foundations and state-based funding agencies have responded to the proposals initiated by teacher groups. The state-based humanities endowments have funded a number of collaborative group projects. Each grant empowered a group of school and college faculty to define agendas and execute their commitment to each other as a community of inquiry in the discipline.

**5. School/college collaborations must focus on action, not on machinery. "Red Tape" is the enemy of good collaboration.**

Alliances confirm Maeroff's observation. The most successful groups have easy access to small amounts of funds to support occasional telephone and mailing costs. They convene at sites recognized as easily accessible by the majority of members. The faculty spend minimal time dealing with administrative structures and budgets and maximum time addressing each other on topics of mutual interest in their academic subject area.

**School and college faculty can use academic alliances to avoid getting stuck in dull career paths and to develop new leadership opportunities.**

# Establishing an Alliance:
# From Theory to Practice

Communities of inquiry are typically initiated by small core groups of interested faculty from schools and colleges who gradually identify others and build the alliance. Current groups have from 12 to 60 members. All alliances share a fundamental similarity critical to their success: membership is open to faculty and administrators from all educational levels from university to elementary school in the same cities, counties, or regions, but only to those teaching or working in the same or closely related disciplines. Those interested in establishing an alliance might proceed as follows.

**Step One: Identify Interested Faculty**

Faculty who begin groups typically contact other faculty in their own department and in local schools and colleges who teach in the same subject area. Local boards of education or state education coordinators often provide lists of elementary and secondary level faculty members.

Principals or deans begin groups by contacting the department heads or selected faculty at their institutions and encouraging them to establish a collaborative group in their own disciplines. Administrators usually invite administrators and faculty from other academic sectors and neighboring institutions to meet with them and their faculty to explore the idea. Together, the administrators and faculty discuss the benefits of the collaborative mode of faculty development and establish realistic incentives for those who help establish or join alliances.

For instance, administrators can offer the groups a small budget for stationery, stamps, telephone, and secretarial support. While teachers in the schools or colleges usually begin the process, administrators may also initiate groups. In Mississippi, the executive director of the State Humanities Council inspired faculty to develop local alliance groups.

**Step Two: Establish a Steering Committee**

Almost all alliance groups need a steering committee in the early stages of development. The committee usually includes representatives from all educational levels offering instruction in the subject in the local area. Postsecondary faculty members should not dominate the committee—either in number or in perceived importance. Those who have primary interest in teaching, as well as those who are more focused on research in the discipline should serve on the committee.

**Alliance groups need a steering committee that includes representatives from all educational levels . . . postsecondary faculty members should not dominate the committee.**

**Step Three: Establish the Alliance Group**

The steering committee should meet to make a founding statement in which they define the geographic area in which the alliance will operate, determine initial goals, prepare a preliminary statement of the major issue of concern to the local faculty teaching that discipline, and suggest specific incentives to encourage faculty participation in the group. Preparing this statement may require several meetings. At the final meeting, the steering committee should establish the date, time, and location of the first meeting of the entire group.

The committee should send copies of the statement to administrators in local schools, community

colleges, colleges, and universities, and ask that they nominate faculty to attend the first meeting. Steering committee members may decide to visit leading administrators and explain the objectives and institutional benefits of faculty alliances, such as cost-effective in-service education and faculty development; a means of building enrollment through contact with high schools; inexpensive community outreach; and recognition as a leader in improving American education. The committee should secure a letter of endorsement for the collaborative group from each administrator.

The steering committee should then send its statement with a letter of invitation to prospective group members. The invitation should describe the concept of an alliance, the group's goals, and the major concerns to be addressed, and indicate the date, time, and place of the first meeting. A telephone call or written reminder might include a copy of the agenda. The first meeting should occur at a centrally located site.

At the meeting, the steering committee should provide background information about the alliance model of collaboration and describe the proposed format of future meetings. The *entire group* should begin to decide which concerns it hopes to address at the local level. Members should also determine together the date, time, location, and agenda of the next meeting. Members will need to select a convenient meeting schedule. Some groups have arranged for elementary and secondary faculty to have 1½ hours of released time each month on the afternoon of their meeting. Finally, the members will need to elect officers. Often one teacher from the schools and one from the postsecondary level will co-chair the group.

**Student teachers, graduate students, and undergraduate majors can make the transition from training to practice through communities of inquiry in their discipline.**

Faculty will also need to consider how to expand the group's membership. Some alliances invite student teachers, graduate students, and undergraduate majors to their meetings. In this way, new colleagues make the transition from training to practice in a community of inquiry in their discipline. Follow-up is also important. The committee should contact those who did not attend and invite them to the next meeting. Submitting an article about the initial meeting to the local newspaper(s) may lead to an increase in attendance at the next meeting.

## What Happens at Meetings

Most teachers have negative responses to "another meeting." Meetings run *by* faculty *for* faculty are rare. Members initially will need to be convinced that they can help determine the program and that the program will be substantive, related to their subject area, and responsive to their needs and interests. Many teachers also expect postsecondary faculty to dominate meetings with school faculty. An explicit acknowledgment that the group will treat all teachers as colleagues, each with valuable knowledge to receive and impart, is called for.

At each meeting, the program itself helps build a community of inquiry among those who teach the discipline. Meetings are often devoted to the following kinds of activities.

*Journal Review*. Colleagues help each other keep up-to-date in their discipline by preparing abstracts of important articles in the current literature in the field. Since few faculty members subscribe to all the journals they should read, and few have the time to read all the ones they do receive, faculty members can save each other time and build common intellectual interests through journal review at meetings.

*Panel Discussions*. Alliances are designed to challenge teachers to think in new ways about their disciplines or to reconsider central issues and texts of long-standing importance to those engaged in the discipline. In some alliances, colleagues select one or two areas of major concern to those in their field as a focus for the year's meetings. Each meeting then includes a special panel discussion on one of those concerns. Group members themselves plan and present this part of the meeting on a rotating basis. College faculty collaborate with—rather than dominate—their colleagues from other academic sectors.

*Demonstration Classes and Curriculum Exchanges*. In these meetings, colleagues help each other improve teaching in the discipline. In some collaborative groups, teachers have found ways to improve articulation, share teaching materials, upgrade segments of the curriculum, and increase student interest in the subject area. Some teachers may visit others' classes and exchange testing and teaching techniques.

*Review of Major Conferences of General Interest*. Rising travel costs and shrinking departmental and system-wide budgets have caused great reductions in travel funds for faculty. As a result, many teach-

ers cannot afford to attend professional meetings. Those who do attend can quickly and efficiently disseminate information presented there upon returning to their groups. Colleagues may also be able to assist each other in securing more opportunities to travel to discipline-specific conferences. Often, school teachers have the most limited opportunities. Postsecondary faculty can help make the case for travel to school boards.

## What Does Not Happen at Meetings

1. Postsecondary faculty do *not* dominate school faculty or take sole responsibility for quality programming. Despite differences in levels of terminal degrees, teachers in the same discipline can and do find common ground and learn from and teach each other.
2. Outside experts do *not* dominate the agenda. Teachers learn to rely on each other to become the experts. Faculty help each other refuse the passive role of spectator in the discipline and accept, instead, the active role of researcher and knowledgeable practitioner.
3. A small clique does *not* exert a strangle hold on group activities.
4. One group does not talk of in-service review of scope and sequence while another discusses the number of credits outside the core distribution requirements required for an official concentration outside the major.
5. There are *no* lengthy lectures that cut off opportunities for questions or reduce the importance of preparatory outside reading by group members.
6. University faculty are not addressed as "Dr." while secondary faculty are called "Mr." or "Mrs." A conscious effort is made to find the common vocabulary necessary to a community of inquiry.

## What Can Administrators Do To Help?

A dean, department chair, or principal can assist with small amounts of money for mailings, with providing comfortable space and refreshments for meetings, with ceremonial support such as offering a welcome and/or signing a letter of invitation. More substantively, as the collaborative process matures, an administrator should entertain requests to extend access to college or university facilities for secondary educators and vice versa whenever practical. Library privileges, free or reduced rate auditing of courses, parking, or whatever makes continuing collaboration practical should be offered, especially as one may be able to do a bit of "horse trading" among local institutions for items such as AV equipment, shared journal subscriptions, etc.

Additionally, an administrator can recognize the value of the alliance effort by providing opportunities for involved faculty to report on their activities to appropriate groups — a faculty planning committee, a trustees' meeting, a school board or supervisor's meeting, the provost's advisory council, etc.

**Outside experts should not dominate the meeting's agenda. Teachers learn to rely on each other to become the experts and accept the active role of researcher and knowledgeable practitioner.**

# Incentives

## Building Incentives for Faculty

Membership in an alliance is testimony to a faculty member's ongoing commitment to his/her subject and to a continued "life of the mind." Whether in a college or high school setting, these commitments virtually insure better classroom performance and/or research. Faculty in alliances repeatedly confirm that the major reward of their membership is personal satisfaction. However, administrators investing in the future good performance of faculty should consider developing direct institutional incentives for faculty involvement in alliances.

An immediate incentive for faculty is the *time* to participate. Administrators in many areas have already granted time off for school teachers to participate in meetings. Others have been freed of regularly assigned extra-curricular duties. At the college level, department chairs have granted alliance organizers and co-directors release from committee assignments and, on occasion, from courses.

Different forms of *credit* also create incentives. In-service education credits, graduate credits, and continuing education units have all been used to certify school teacher participation. College faculty, in turn, have received formal letters of appreciation for their personnel files and teaching and service awards in recognition of their alliance work.

The most obvious ways for institutions to reward faculty and create incentives are to increase salary and to give credit toward tenure and promotion. School and college faculty do not receive institutional or grant stipends to attend alliance meetings. Membership and attendance should remain their own reward, but institutions should value the academic accomplishments associated with alliance activities by, for example, giving raises for community service and voluntary professional development.

At the postsecondary level, credit toward tenure and promotion can be offered under the teaching, research, or service categories. Oddly enough in the tenure and promotion process, only the research and service categories look beyond the institution's walls. Research is evaluated on the quality of the faculty member's contribution to the discipline at large. Service usually includes departmental and institution-wide committees, as well as service in state and national organizations in the discipline.

**Administrators investing in the future good performance of faculty should consider developing direct institutional incentives for faculty involvement in alliances.**

The "teaching" category also should have an extramural dimension. Faculty should receive credit for excellent teaching both in their own classes and in local communities of inquiry in their discipline. Faculty teaching each other deserve to have that effort recognized for the asset it is to all students of the discipline: those who take and those who teach classes.

Forward-looking department chairs, deans, and provosts have already begun to use the tenure and promotion incentives to encourage alliance work among their faculty members. Obviously these efforts should not supplant the institution's existing value structure; they should supplement it and recognize the rich benefits to the individual faculty members, and their students, colleagues, and the discipline that engages them.

## Institutional Incentives:

### The Principal's View*

Edwin Delattre, in his brilliant essay "The Intellectual Lives of Teachers" offered some propositions pertaining to excellence:

> First, the purpose of formal education is to nurture and cultivate certain specific powers of mind and heart which have application in all human endeavors.
>
> Second, no one can begin to do an adequate job of nurturing these powers in others, particularly in the young, who is not permanently cultivating them in himself or herself; that is, no one not engaged in ongoing self-improvement of the mind can resist the bigotry of fashion and the poor teaching that follows from it.
>
> Third, in-service education must be designed in acknowledgement of these truths.
>
> Fourth, schools must (yes, must) encourage, support, and pay for continued study and learning by their teachers, principals, and superintendents. (pp. 154-162)

**Faculty should receive credit for excellent teaching both in their own classes and in local communities of inquiry . . . they deserve to have that effort recognized for the asset it is to all students: those who take and those who teach classes.**

As the complexity and intensity of demands on local school districts increase, we must find innovative, creative ways to re-engage the teaching staff. Graduate courses not related to the discipline being taught, and in-service days that are sporadic and unconnected to real life, too often have proven inadequate.

Districts have created incentives for teachers to return to graduate school and accumulate credits beyond the bachelor's degree, including a raise in salary if a master's degree in education is obtained, or steps on the salary schedule (resulting in more modest raises) for specific credits shy of the master's degree.

Unfortunately, many teachers acquire credits in areas that have no bearing on their teaching assignment. For example, an English teacher may decide to acquire an administrator's certificate or a certificate in another subject area. While this kind of course work provides the profession with more flexible teachers in terms of career or assignments, it utterly fails to provide educators with any incentives to improve knowledge of their subject area or classroom performance. In fact, it is no secret that administrative certificates provide incentives for leader-teachers to leave the classroom altogether.

Another (usually inefficient) approach taken by districts can be found in the ever-present inservice programs that frequently deal with subjects of little relation to classroom instruction. Too often, these programs are sporadic and exhibit no continuity from one session to another. They reflect the philosophy that general topics can be made valid for all teachers, with content in each program varying from drugs to health to general curriculum concerns. Rarely are these days given over to intensive explorations of content areas where teachers can review and discuss topics specifically and directly related to their subjects. They are sessions to be endured and forgotten.

In contrast to these two traditional approaches, local alliances are a perfect vehicle for fostering what Dan Lorti calls the "psychic and ancillary rewards of teaching." By their very nature, they deal directly with issues of great importance to participants, prevent isolation by including educators of students of all ages, and foster dialogue among professional adults. Alliances are free of bureaucratic and peripheral considerations, their agendas are set by the membership, and their focus is on personal renewal, pedagogical developments, and content discovery. Participants are free to pursue authentic interests and concerns.

As part of each alliance meeting, scholarly articles are usually reviewed, and reports from national and state meetings are heard. Since the participants are equal in status, people feel free to challenge assumptions that otherwise would be accepted *prima facie*. And, because the meetings deal exclusively with authentic issues, the dialogue that ensues produces brisk exchanges of views and real insights. The knowledge gained through mutual contributions at the meetings is easily transferable to the local district and to the classroom where students are the ultimate beneficiaries.

In addition to the above-mentioned benefits to individual faculty, alliances provide school districts

**This essay was contributed by Dr. Stephan Charton, principal of University High School in Normal, Illinois. Dr. Charton has worked with his faculty and those at Illinois State University to form foreign languages and literature and history alliances.*

with faculty who are engaged in their profession, focused on the improvement of teaching, and willing to work within their schools or at the district level on school or district-wide problems. Over the past few years, state legislatures and state education agencies have placed new demands upon school districts in the form of revised requirements for high school diplomas, establishing and evaluating standards for student progress, and revised standards for admission to colleges. Each year, local districts must review and revise their priorities and expectations for students both in response to new state initiatives and as part of the overall process of improving student learning environments. Faculty can and should be involved in this change process, and a local alliance is an ideal source of faculty expertise.

## The Postsecondary Administrator's View

Postsecondary faculty in many areas suffer from low morale and stress. They feel overworked and undervalued. The statistics on faculty who would select a teaching career if they could start their professional lives over again suggest that the ivory tower has lost some of its prestige, that its pristine walls are graffitied with aliens signs.

One of the most important reasons for administrators to encourage academic alliances is to address these morale problems. Many faculty report that their work with other adults committed to their discipline has given them a renewed sense of the importance of teaching, raised their self-esteem, and helped them refocus on the positive aspects of academic life. Opportunities to meet and discuss significant issues and texts with other adults reconnect them to interesting problems in the discipline beyond those related to students' current assignments. In addition, alliances can, and have, extended faculty thinking beyond their personal circumstances. They benefit by being involved in activities that have a larger institutional context.

Another incentive for encouraging alliances is to improve communication between secondary and postsecondary faculty. Clear understanding of the essentials of the discipline at the next level enables teachers to isolate and stress the essential concepts at one's immediate level of concern. Alliance members, while focused on their common field, engage these questions on a substantive level and overcome disarticulation from a knowledge base rather than through reliance on a "curriculum."

In many college settings, feeder high schools provide a significant proportion of an institution's student body. College faculty in these areas report that the time and energy they spend with school teachers pays off in better educated students with stronger abilities, achievements, goals, and awareness of what college-level work implies. College faculty see their students coming and have a chance to prepare for them and to affect their progress.

As the nation faces an anticipated shortage of recruits to the ranks of college faculty, enlightened self-interest will suggest other benefits of academic alliance groups. In competition for the best young minds, the academic profession may stand to attract better candidates if it increasingly asserts a more visible leadership role in our society. Where local school and college faculty work closely together, their visible efforts may help identify able young people and inspire them to consider academic careers. In fact, a number of alliances already offer membership to college majors as well as to graduate students entering the field.

Because they are discipline based, alliances naturally respond to the departmental units of organization in most higher education institutions. This is critically important for the administrator looking for leverage within a fixed structure rather than activities to include in the annual report. An alliance could be asked to offer feedback on proposed departmental curriculum revisions at the core level, proposed textbook selection, part-time faculty recruitment and appointments, or library and laboratory acquisitions. Moreover, the functioning alliance can provide invaluable assistance to a harried dean seeking advice on "good practice" in a discipline or documentation of junior colleagues' contributions to effectiveness in teaching.

**College faculty report that the time they spend with school teachers pays off in better educated students with stronger abilities, achievements, goals, and awareness of what college-level work implies.**

# Contributors to Collaboration

Arts and sciences faculty are the most common participants in alliances; the case studies cited in Appendix A focus on these fields. However, do not overlook the wide range of additional groups that can be key contributors to collaboration. Education and continuing education departments are ideally placed to assist postsecondary educators in launching and sustaining collaboration.

## Schools of Education

Schools of education have received substantial criticism in the spate of reports on the failings of secondary education. As the specialized trainers of the teaching corps for most secondary institutions, their curricula have been called inadequate, their students "weak," and their in-service offerings (continuing professional education for teachers) uninspired.

The phenomenon resembles the criticism of English departments for college graduates' deficiencies in written and verbal communication. There is no doubt that English departments generally are less than perfect, but they should hardly shoulder exclusive blame for failures of an entire system. Teacher education is an institutional responsibility. As arts and sciences divisions recognize the importance of transmitting a "sense of the discipline" to future school teachers, subject specialists will need to collaborate closely with education school colleagues in the common mission of teacher education.

Schools of education have always stayed in closer touch with elementary and secondary colleagues than have schools of letters or professional schools. They remain unequaled repositories of knowledge concerning the curricula that encode discipline-based knowledge in our school system, the politics of institutional change in schools, and the needs of teachers and administrators alike. In those universitites fortunate enough to make joint appointments between discipline-based departments and schools of education, or to appoint pedagogical specialists in science, math, and foreign languages, the possibilities for linking discipline specialists with secondary colleagues and, thus, nurturing local alliances are excellent.

**Schools of education have always stayed in closer touch with elementary and secondary colleagues than have schools of letters or professional schools.**

Most programs that foster closer working relationships between schools of education and local school faculty are task-oriented partnerships. Maeroff chronicles a wide variety of programs that focus on student acceleration, improved teacher training, improved in-service programs, and/or cooperative curriculum development projects. Collaborative research is also a common undertaking.

On the other hand, some schools of education have recently used their contacts and visibility to serve a broader agenda, including linking subject matter specialists throughout their institutions with school educators. The resulting programs create a more diversified set of personal and professional development activities for teachers than the traditional in-service agenda. Programs at the Yale/New Haven Institute, Brown University, and UCLA, to mention a few, stress comprehensive and on-going contact between a variety of secondary and postsecondary educators.

Such initiatives, though more institutionally oriented than independent alliances, must be

applauded for the diversity of possibilities they bring to teachers. They also provide access to senior-level management in secondary education and often in postsecondary education as well.

There is general agreement that the lack of classroom and subject matter experience on the part of administrators creates impediments to good practice in a given field. Science teachers regularly complain that poor understanding of science, and therefore of science teaching aids, makes it difficult for them to make their case for greater equipment investments, storage space, supply budgets, and reasonable class sizes. Foreign language faculty voice similar concerns when faced with consistently unsympathetic managers. Existing networks that link schools of education to professional secondary administrators provide excellent conduits for a flow of information between management and content specialists.

## Continuing Education Divisions

Continuing education units offer convenient resources to school and college faculty establishing academic alliances. While such units usually have eclectic sets of programs and activities, most carry a mandate to extend the resources of their college or university to off-campus constituencies. They may thus serve as active brokers in the establishment of links between discipline specialists at different academic levels.

The precise role of continuing education in the process will vary according to institutional organization. If the continuing education/outreach function is decentralized, as may be the case at large institutions, the arts and sciences continuing education division will be well placed to help. Staff people in such an office will probably have academic credentials in arts and sciences disciplines and thus quickly understand the benefits of school/college faculty collaboration. Moreover, they will probably already have a variety of off-campus contacts through their outreach activities and may well be able to offer suggestions for contacts in the schools. Most importantly, these educators will have susbstantial experience already with the logistics of organizing calls to meetings, larger mailings, convenient facilities, etc. At the University of Pennsylvania, for example, the arts and sciences outreach division, called the College of General Studies, serves as the instructors' host and manager for dozens of collaborative projects involving local faculty.

A centralized continuing education division, such as those found at many state institutions as well as at smaller private colleges may prove even more useful in the management of collaboration. Such an office will encompass a broad range of functions, including the capacity to make links with any discipline or program within a school. Facilities and equipment for meetings will surely be available at larger institutions and, in many cases, the division will have the capacity to arrange teleconferences, closed circuit TV, and other technology-based mechanisms for meetings. Such facilities are particularly useful in rural areas and during extended periods of bad weather.

The initial period of alliance organization and discussion should probably not focus too rapidly on specific tasks or projects that require outside funding. There is a clear danger that goal-oriented collaboration will lose its momentum when a task is completed or a laboriously drafted proposal is rejected by the funding agency. There is plenty to do to search out "common ground" and build mutual respect before launching major projects. When the time for such activities comes, however, continuing education faculty may be able to lend considerable assistance and experience to drafting proposals and managing funds.

## Local Professional Organizations

Local chapters of professional discipline-based organizations are natural allies in the initiation of alliances, particularly if they exhibit sensitivity to the agenda and operating ethos of the alliance.

An academic alliance will frequently supplement and complement the more formal agendas of larger organizations. For example, the relationship of local alliances to regional and state teacher organizations has been extensive in many areas. Groups have tended to thrive best where the relationship was clear and complementary. Ideally, collaborative groups meet monthly except during the months a state or regional organizational meeting is scheduled. Between major, larger meetings, local faculty create ongoing opportunities for themselves in the smaller, more focused alliance meetings. They disseminate the information from the regional meetings and develop and shape future agendas through the professional work they do in the more informal local settings. Teachers who have been inactive in state and regional organizations can often become reengaged through involvement in the local alliance groups. As a result, the national, regional, and state organizations are likely to be strengthened by more active, professionally engaged alliance members.

# Privilege Or Responsibility

## Building a New Tradition

College and university faculty are among the most privileged people in our society. They have had extensive time and resources expended to assist them in the achievement of advanced educational levels. Despite comparatively low salaries, they have more freedom in the use of their time and energy than most other professional people. They can often choose at least some of the courses they teach, and therefore the materials they and their students read. They freely select the subjects about which they write. They usually have more "unscheduled" time than school teachers, let alone doctors, lawyers, and business executives. Tenure offers the privilege of conscience, the assured freedom to speak, hold forth on personal opinions, and pursue research with no fear of job loss — a privilege afforded in few other professional settings. It is precisely the traditions of this republic and the stability in our current social, economic, and political framework that assure the American professoriate that it can maintain its privileges. But with these privileges come special responsibilities beyond the classroom. Call it professorial philanthropy, if you will.

**College and university faculty are among the most privileged people in our society. They have more freedom in the use of their time and energy than most other professional people. But with these privileges come special responsibilities.**

Corporations are encouraged to act like responsible citizens and contribute to the common good by sharing some of their wealth. Besides enlightened self-interest, the rationale for corporate philanthropy rests on the recognition that corporations succeed in part because the traditions of the republic and the current social, economic, and political framework assure an atomosphere conducive to productivity and profit. Professors share their "wealth," which is learning, by taking the initiative to open the doors of their communities of inquiry to include school faculty. Like the corporations, college and university faculty benefit from a strong society and have special privileges within it. Their contribution to the common good is a civic duty. Given their career choice, postsecondary faculty have at least two major public roles to play as citizens:

1. to help assure that American education will remain a vehicle for upward mobility for all groups in our democracy;
2. to expand the power of American citizens to cope with the demands of the information society.

Opening communities of inquiry to school faculty offers an ideal way for college faculty to fulfill these roles without overstepping their areas of competence. Faculty in collaborative groups currently report that they find their work with school faculty helps assure better quality education for diverse populations in the K-12 age group. This is particularly true in areas where there are high numbers of non-college educated parents. While college faculty themselves are often totally unprepared to deal with the demands of disadvantaged students, their sustained engagement with these students' teachers can help strengthen the schools. Bright and highly motivated school teachers will remain in teaching in greater numbers in areas where they can enjoy long-

term professional and collegial relationships with neighboring college faculty. Retention of good teachers is the best assurance that American education will open professional doors to a broad spectrum of American students. University faculty can help by sharing their academic wealth with their colleagues in the schools.

As citizens in the most powerful information society in the world, America's professoriate has another kind of wealth to share. In our classes and research projects, we practice the crucial skills needed in the post-industrial age. On a daily basis we identify and develop data, move data into information, and transform information into knowledge. Occasionally, we may even distill some wisdom from the knowledge we acquire. As Harlan Cleveland notes, many college and university faculty may not even be aware of the extent to which their skills lie at the heart of the Information Society — a society that depends on the power to gather and decode data; analyze, classify, and interpret information; and develop, expand, and apply knowedge. These are the steps we follow in our teaching and researching, and in our classrooms, libraries, and publications. If the Industrial Society depended on extending human muscle power, the Information Society depends on extending our brain power. In expanding communities of inquiry to include school faculty, we have the greatest chance of maximizing the power of American citizens to cope wisely and productively with the demands of the globally interdependent information society.

## Refining the Profile

School and college faculty need to forge a new tradition of mutual respect and sustained intellectual and professional engagement. This tradition can emerge in the next five years if:

1. careful objective evaluation is done on all major current collaborative projects so that successful ventures can be identified and disseminated, guidelines developed, and good practice rewarded;
2. college and school faculty commit themselves to each other, to excellence in the discipline, and to sustained communities of inquiry;
3. administrators and faculties adjust faculty rewards to place significant value on the work of those engaged in local communities of inquiry.

American education has lived with a tradition of separation of faculties according to the ages of their students. This tradition is implicated as a culprit in the current dissatisfaction with the quality of American education. It made sense at a certain time in our history. It no longer does.

As we move toward the 21st century, it becomes clear that current generations live in a different environment from the ones that established the tradition of segregation of school and college faculty. Education is no longer a privilege; it is a right, a path to upward mobility in society, a constant component of adult life almost regardless of the adult's career. Continuing education occurs in academic, community, corporate, and government settings. The teaching profession has changed. Increased formal course work and degree study has reduced the education gap between school and college faculty in the last 100 years. Increases in the number of students proceeding from the schools to higher education has created greater commonality among school and college facutly in their student pool.

> ...the critical intelligence will attempt to improve the tradition by refining it...This refinement consists of making ostensibly minor reformulations, clarifying definitions, differentiating categories or grouping them under more general categories, resolving apparent contradictions, and restoring the unity of the body of belief... (Shils, p. 216)

The change in the professional profile of America's faculty entails the kind of adjustment Shils suggests. We must regroup along lines more appropriate to the needs of citizens in the changed and changing environment. By opening communities of inquiry to school and college faculty, the educational sector will define its own coming of age in the Information Society.

**As we move toward the 21st century, it becomes clear that current generations live in a different environment from the ones that established the tradition of segregation of school and college faculty.**

## Appendix A

# Alliances in the Disciplines

The following examples illustrate how the Academic Alliance concept works in a variety of disciplines. Addresses of coordinators for each discipline are included in each section. For more detailed information on establishing an alliance in any academic subject area, contact:

Claire Gaudiani
Academic Alliances
Logan Hall
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6384

## Alliances in Foreign Languages and Literatures

Nearly one hundred groups now participate in a network called "Academic Alliances in Foreign Languages and Literatures." These groups engage over 3,000 faculty in the most elaborate, and growing, set of communities of inquiry in any discipline. A newsletter called *Collaborare* is mailed to member groups from Ellen Silber, associate professor of French, Marymount College, who was appointed Foreign Language Alliance network coordinator in 1985. The collaborative group members also share news by writing about their efforts in a section reserved for that purpose in the *Foreign Language Annals*.

The success of foreign language and literature alliances is testimony to the contention that school and college faculty can develop a common agenda, maintain commitments to each other and their discipline, and generally sustain a constructive engagement over time. The diversity in geographical areas and kinds of institutions suggests that communities of inquiry can overcome the obvious barriers that would seem to hold school and college teachers in separate camps.

Claire Gaudiani launched the foreign language and literature alliances in 1981 with funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities, Rockefeller Foundation, Exxon Education Foundation, and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. Funds were used to disseminate materials and teach faculty groups how to establish communities of inquiry among school and college teachers. Funds also covered part of the expenses for a five person team from each potential collaborative group to attend one of the project's four regional conferences. No group of faculty was given any money to initiate their community of inquiry. Participants at each conference heard college and high school faculty present a series of lecture/discussions on the major issues in the discipline. They also reviewed the challenges to sustained collaboration among school and college faculty, discussed incentives and rewards, and learned how to develop resources to support their efforts. Video tapes were made of all conference presentations and teams returned to their collaborative groups with copies to share during subsequent meetings.

Alliance groups report that they have taken up new areas of the field. For instance, a number of groups have learned about the new oral proficiency tests and their implications for language classrooms.

- At its inaugural meeting, the "Illiana" Foreign Language Cooperative featured a guest speaker on the topic of oral proficiency. Recommended readings were provided in advance to enhance the discussion period after the presentation.
- The Springfield (MA) Foreign Language Cooperative planned a workshop series on the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Guidelines. Materials and presenters at the workshop received partial support from a grant from the State Department of Education. The funding proposal was prepared by the faculty participants from school and college levels.
- Two teachers from Walpole (MA) High School shared their experience rewriting the French curriculum in view of the Oral Proficiency Guidelines with fellow members of the Boston Collaborative. A col-

lege faculty member presented his experience as an Oral Proficiency Tester.

- The Central Indiana Committee on Foreign Language Studies held a working conference on microcomputers and software availability for foreign language education. Each participant enjoyed two hours of "hands-on" time supervised by high school teachers familiar with the software.
- The Milwaukee Area Collaborative Group, based at Mount Mary College, held a "Hands-On Computers" day.

Alliance groups also study texts together. The Santa Clara/San Mateo (CA) Alliance translated into English the French, German, and Spanish versions of a two-page passage from Hemingway. They then compared their translations to the original English and discussed the adequacy of the foreign language versions. They reflected on the losses and gains in text translation and ultimately focused on how to advance close reading and comprehension skills by using translation exercises.

The Alliances also report that they can recognize and rectify local malpractice in their discipline. In one area, the local principal scheduled German I, II, III, IV in the same classroom where in previous years the first and second year classes had been separated from third and fourth. The local alliance co-directors felt that this arrangement was not in the best interest of the students, teacher, or the discipline. They arranged for the third and fourth year students to meet with the university's intermediate German class on a temporary basis for first semester.

In another case, a Spanish teacher left the school and the principal, faced with budgetary constrictions, assigned a home economics teacher who had had two years of college Spanish to teach the Spanish curriculum. This person felt very unprepared, having had no contact with the field for twenty years. When the situation came to the attention of local alliance members, they were able to recommend a suitably-trained part-time replacement for the position from among the recently graduated Spanish majors.

Alliance groups have helped new teachers by offering them their resources, providing opportunities for them to speak the language they teach with other adults, and by sharing advice on summer study programs and fellowships. The Alliances publicized and reviewed proposals for the Rockefeller Foundation Fellowships for Foreign Language Teachers in the High Schools. University faculty helped school faculty design and prepare study plans.

Language alliances have helped to improve articulation between school and college language study. In one area the college changed its text books after the faculty reviewed the high school curriculum and recognized how advanced students were likely to be when they arrived on its college campus.

Alliances also enable faculty to advise state and local officials on the needs of education in their discipline. For example, the Albuquerque Language Teachers Association suggested the need for a state supervisor in languages and was asked to form a Task Force to investigate reinstating the position. The Las Vegas Collaborative, the State of New Mexico, and the Albuquerque Collaborative appointed Task Force members and drew up suggested strategies.

The Academic Alliances in Foreign Languages have institutionalized themselves in a number of different ways. The Santa Clara/San Mateo group receives administrative support from the Center for Research in International Studies at Stanford University. The alliance of 65-70 members is helping to spearhead a set of 12 alliances throughout the state sponsored by the state government. David Grossman and Ron Herring from the Stanford Center provided key leadership to the faculty groups and, more importantly, made the group aware of its own leadership potential. The Stanford University faculty, University of Santa Clara, Cabrillo Community College, and high school and middle school teachers coordinate their own meetings — a wine and cheese hour, a conference hour, and dinner one evening a month. They present their own programs, but the administrative support and funding from the state legislature has had a very positive effect on the faculty.

For further information on establishing an Alliance in Foreign Languages contact:

Ellen Silber
Associate Professor of French
Marymount College
Box 1368
Tarrytown, NY 10591-3796
(914) 631-3200, ext 382, 427

## Alliances In History

In 1984, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Exxon Education Foundation invited the American History Association (AHA) to consider adapting the foreign language alliance model to encourage sustained commitments among school and college history faculty. Because of the range of backgrounds among those teaching history in the schools, the planners suggested that a common academic subject be identified for alliance meetings to provide faculty with a more productive engagement in the early stages. The study of Constitutionalism in American Life was chosen as the topic of inquiry.

In addition to this coordinated academic agenda, the history alliances added funded summer

institutes to the common area of study of group members. The history alliance project started with five sites; there are now twenty-eight.

The AHA proposal clearly articulates the aims and advantages of the model for history. Groups involve approximately thirty individuals including high school social studies teachers with history teaching responsibilities, college history faculty, and trained historians not affiliated with schools or academic institutions (e.g. archivists, librarians, preservationists, public historians). The AHA puts it this way:

> It is our hope that each local professional organization will become an ongoing history association, taking up other historical issues at the end of the year of study. A community-based model for professional development has several advantages:
>
> 1. it allows for the identification of needs by persons who are by definition in the best position to know what those needs are;
> 2. it emphasizes inclusivity rather than exclusivity, and thus can reach down to involve entire school districts and local colleges;
> 3. it views professional enrichment as an ongoing process, rather than "one shot;"
> 4. because participating schools and colleges must formally commit themselves to the concept of the collaborative as a condition of participation, teachers will enjoy the support of their institutions when they return to their classrooms;
> 5. it opens the door for a continuing education collaboration between schools and colleges;
> 6. it carries the potential for strengthening the public appreciation for history in a community by uniting the community's teaching and academic resources;
> 7. and, because a local collaborative will depend upon the enthusiasm of participants, it can be launched and sustained at minimum cost.

Early reports from the history "seminars" are encouraging for their emphasis on collegiality and respect for the discipline:

> "A number of the participants commented to me personally, and to Mr. Wiggins, that it was refreshing to be treated as a fellow professional. In my own discussion group, I referred to the participants as "Mr." or "Mrs." (all the females in the group were married), to invoke an air of professional formality. Such titles are in marked contrast to most meetings of educators, who incline to the informal (Buscagliarizing, it's called), and, as a counterpoint to the informality of a seven person discussion group, helped to set a professional tone. No attempt was ever made either to embarrass or single out participants for incorrect or unfocused answers, or to do anything else which might generate resentment from the participants. Arrogance or power displays have no place in these seminars. I should add, however, that it is imperative to engage students professionally on matters of interpretive disagreement. Such disagreements are inevitable — and indeed, desirable in such a setting — and do much to enliven the proceeding, *provided* the proper tone of professional inquiry has been established."
>
> "University professors and public school teachers in the social sciences and history have common concerns, an area of professional overlap which enterprises such as this can accentuate. But their professional concerns are not identical, and it is important to focus on those areas of shared concern to the exclusion of other uncommon problems."
>
> "These seminars in and of themselves will not resurrect the quality of social studies instruction in the public schools, even in the schools in which seminars have been implemented. They are instead a necessary first step if the social studies curriculum in the public schools of this country is ever to be reclaimed as a proper place for serious inquiry." (Quotes from the Interim Report on the Aluchua County Collaborative Seminar, Summer 1985. by Augustus Burn, Seminar Director, University of Florida, Gainesville)

For more information on history collaboratives, contact:

Deborah Welch
Project Director
American Historical Association
400 A Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003

## Alliances in International Studies

The Bay Area Global Education Program (BAGEP) offers a model in the international studies area. This project, initiated in 1979, resulted from a consortium formed by Stanford University, the World Affairs Council of Northern California, and Global Perspectives in Education.

> "The program was developed to overcome a dilemma. Many of the resources needed by schools to upgrade international studies instruction are in higher education institutions and other non-school organizations. And, although many international specialists from universities, businesses, and world affairs organizations are deeply interested in helping to strengthen world affairs instruction in K-12 schools, most have no systematic way to make effective contributions. BAGEP provided a way to translate this interest and experience into instructional materials and training services useful to schools on a consistent, long-term basis."

Ron Herring, associate director of Stanford University's Center for Research in International Studies, announced in January 1986 that the Cali-

fornia State Legislature had passed and the governor has signed a bill to:

> ...establish the California International Studies Project, a cooperating network of international studies resource centers. The centers would provide curriculum materials and staff training services to school districts in their immediate area that want to improve their students' skills and knowledge related to foreign languages, other cultures, and international issues. The emphasis would be on broadening the outlook and strengthening the international competence of classroom teachers.
>
> Although they would be based in four-year colleges or universities, the centers would be cooperative efforts. They would coordinate and focus the international resources of various local organizations—universities, businesses, world affairs councils, exchange programs, community groups, etc.— that are committed to helping schools upgrade instruction in this field. Internationalists from such organizations would collaborate with teacher training specialists and county office of education personnel in working partnerships to design and offer local programs.
>
> The project proposed employs a "teachers teaching teachers" strategy. Project staff, scholars, and others with international training and experience would instruct leadership teams of teachers from participating school districts during summer institutes and quarterly follow-up sessions. This training would include curriculum materials, teaching strategies, and subject-matter content needed to teach about the cultures of Latin America or Pacific Basin, for example, or about international trade and development. International specialists would then assist these specially trained teachers to organize and conduct similar training activities for fellow teachers in their own districts.
>
> Under the provision of the Farr bill, 18 geographically distributed resource centers would be established to provide these services." (Assembly Bill Number 2543, Sam Farr (D-Monterey))

Faculty in Alliances of Foreign Languages and Literatures also participate in the California plan. Contact:

Ron Herring
Center for Research in International Studies
Stanford University
Room 200, Lou Henry Hoover Building
Stanford, CA 94305-2319
(415) 479-3347, 4581

## Alliances in Geography

Geography educators from secondary schools, community colleges, and state universities in California have been meeting since 1983 seeking ways to improve geography education in the schools. This initial group, based at UCLA and led by Dr. Christopher Salter, was instrumental in drafting a model secondary curriculum to include geography in the state-mandated history/social studies curriculum.

This successful collaboration of some 200 educators has served as a model for the creation of new geographic alliances in other states. With support from the National Georgraphic Society, alliances have begun in six states (besides California) and the District of Columbia. In addition, an ambitious summer geography institute was launched in 1986, also with support from NGS.

The forty secondary and intermediate school participants involved in the summer institutes were selected in conjunction with the state alliances. Participants pledge to return to their home states to further the role of geography education in the curriculum through support and expansion of the state alliances. Plans also call for the enlistment of the existing state geographic societies in the alliances. Contact:

Christopher L. Salter
Department of Geography
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Kimball Love
National Geographic Society
Washington, DC 20036

## Alliances in English

The field of English studies poses special challenges to anyone attempting to organize permanent professional liaisons among college and school teachers. English teachers are usually the largest group of educators in any area and their training and curricula vary widely. However, since they share common goals for advancing the reading, writing, and critical thinking skills of America's citizens, they have a great deal to teach each other. In urban as well as suburban and rural areas, school and college English teachers are continuing to broaden each other's horizons and to challenge each other to read more widely. Working together, many are discovering ways to bring new and important books from a variety of authors — particularly minorities and women — into their own canon and to expand the knowledge and skills they are committed to building among students.

The National Writing Project offers a celebrated example of school/college faculty interaction in English. This project, singled out for excellence in Maeroff's *School and College*, focuses on a single concern — the teaching of process writing. It engages teachers in the task of writing and editing.

The Bread Loaf School in Middlebury, Vermont is another example of a writing-centered effort

to address the needs of school and college English faculty. "Bread Loafers" from all academic sectors report changes in their engagement in their field, improved self-esteem, and better classes as a result of their experience in summer institutes. Efforts are currently underway to obtain outside funding to create a national project designed to create English alliances. Contact:

Paul Cubeta and Dixie Goswami
The Bread Loaf School of English
Middlebury College
Middlebury, VT 05753
(802) 388-3711, ext. 5418

Local groups are already functioning in several communities. The Springfield (MA) English Teachers Collaborative has a planning committee which takes ideas and develops programs for English faculty. Modest annual dues are charged to members for postage and refreshments, but cooperating institutions have donated these fees as well as the cost of designing and printing a brochure for the group. Recent meetings have focused on writing and peer evaluation; for one meeting, a group of 25 teachers braved a snowstorm to hear a poet who is the managing producer of an amateur theater in Springfield. The first half hour of the meetings are for "sign in" and socializing. All participants have indicated their enthusiasm for this social hour, since time for exchanging ideas with colleagues is rare during the work day.

The Illinois State/University High School group in Normal, Illinois has given high school teachers the opportunity to teach freshman writing courses at the university while university faculty reciprocate by teaching in the high school. A recent meeting featured discussions on "Reading and Writing Strategies." Thirty-five teachers from the elementary through college level participated. "Articulation Across the Grades" was covered at a subsequent meeting and the collaborative also joined a regularly scheduled conference for English teachers.

## Alliances in Science and Math

Extraordinary centrifugal pressures move secondary and postsecondary science educators apart. Competition from industry leads to constant shortages of qualified secondary science educators and leaves many poorly prepared science teachers in the classroom. The rapid pace of scientific and technological discovery causes curricula to become rapidly dated. The reliance on sophisticated equipment in the practice of modern science makes "doing" science at the secondary level difficult if not impossible. Only a shared commitment to the discipline on both sides can overcome these pressures and find common ground.

The needs of science educators at the secondary level are hardly unique, but institutionally-generated challenges are well known to college faculty as well. Large classes continue even in times of dwindling enrollments in many areas as administrators seek to create efficiencies through consolidation. Curricula suffer from lack of up-to-date equipment and sufficient laboratory space. Perhaps most intractable of all is the sense that "management" does not understand the enterprise of science education or its needs. On the more critical personal level, science educators suffer from professional isolation from the scientific community, inadequate opportunities for continued professional growth, and general lack of "new blood" in a field where the average age is 50 or older.

Some communities have already sought remedies to these problems through secondary/postsecondary collaboration. The Detroit Metropolitan Area Physics Teachers (DMAPT) is an alliance that has been in existence for thirty years — since the era of PSSC physics. Area instructors of physics at all levels meet regularly to share ideas and materials, to recognize effective practitioners, and generally to affiliate in a local guild. The DMAPT convenes bi-monthly meetings of area physics teachers; meeting sites rotate among area secondary and postsecondary institutions, as do the elected yearly positions of president and vice-president. Programs stress working on projects and demonstrations and allow plenty of time for informal chats. No money or credit changes hands among the 90 or so members. Contact:

Robert Williamson
Department of Physics
Oakland University
Rochester, MI
(313) 370-3416

Alan Gibson
Adams High School
Rochester, MI 48663
(313) 652-0116

John J. Russell
Department of Physics
Southeastern Massachusetts University
North Dartmouth, MA 02747

Earl Zwicker
Illinois Insitutue of Technology
3300 South Federal Street
Chicago, IL 60616-9982

The College-High School Interaction Committee (CHIC), a joint effort of the American Association of Physics Teachers and the American Physical Society, has produced a major effort to promote the creation of a nationwide network of local physics collaboratives. Building on the Academic Alliances model originally supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities, CHIC has applied for National Science Foundation support to conduct four regional conferences for teams of secondary and postsecondary physics educators. The goal of the project is to launch over 100 local collaboratives in physics with the know-how for establishing a local agenda, strategies for sustained collaboration, and ongoing support for this developing national network.

Another noteworthy initiative has a technological base. A biologist and a chemist at Western Carolina University launched the WCU Micronet project in 1982. This computer-based network now links 75 North Carolina science and math classrooms with WCU and each other. Teachers use the network to consult with colleagues, engage students in competitions and research, and update course materials. The network includes an electronic mail system, a directory of state resource people, including non-academic scientists in state agencies, a journal reprint service, a speakers bureau, an on-line data base of commercial science software, and computer journals.

Also included in the network is graduate level courseware available to teachers throughout the state for academic credit. Secondary science students have access to weekly quizzes and problem solving competitions, research participation with university faculty, and "pen pal" opportunities with peers.

The initial support for this innovative approach to collaboration came from Western Carolina University. Subsequent support has come from the National Science Foundation to include a programmer and summer stipends for secondary teachers to design network activities. In a region without a large urban center, this approach to resource sharing among colleagues is both cost efficient and genuinely collaborative in its conception and execution. Contact:

Linda J. Perry
WCU MicroNet Project
Western Carolina University
Cullowhee, NC 28723
(704) 227-7633

While the physics groups and the North Carolina project have, to date, concentrated on developing networks of teachers, recent initiatives have also sought to engage other practitioners of science in a given region for the benefit of all. The Ford Foundation has underwritten seven regional networks of mathematics professionals designed to engage teachers in the larger mathematics community in their areas. Citing unprofessional working conditions as a key problem identified in many assessments of secondary educational difficulties, the Foundation has initiated pilot collaboratives in Philadelphia, Durham (NC), Los Angeles, Cleveland, Minneapolis, San Francisco, and Pittsburgh with the explicit intention of promoting opportunities for secondary mathematics educators to join the discipline's practitioners as colleagues.

The range of current activities includes internships in industry for teachers in Cleveland as well as a mini-grant program for the schools, a problem-solving seminar including university-based mathematicians in Minneapolis, and a mathematical modeling program in the physical sciences based at the Exploratorium in San Francisco. The San Francisco collaborative also includes a dinner-lecture series involving industrial, corporate, and medical mathematics practitioners. In Philadelphia, the program is based at the Franklin Institute, a multi-dimensional science museum and research center. The Ford-funded initiative complements a local project called PRISM (Philadelphia Renaissance in Science and Mathematics) which also links local corporate sponsors with city teachers to create equipment lending programs, speakers bureaus, and mini-grant competitions. Contact:

Barbara Scott Nelson
The Ford Foundation
320 E. 43rd Street
New York, NY 10017
(212) 573-5268

The Camille and Henry Dreyfus Foundation launched a major national pilot project to develop academic alliance groups among physics, chemistry, and mathematics faculty in schools and colleges. This project invites former Dreyfus Foundation Fellows to establish local communities of inquiry. Alliance groups are open to non-Dreyfus fellows and, after a probationary or start up period, will benefit from access to Foundation funds for special projects developed by the alliance faculty. Contact:

Amie Knox
Camille and Henry Dreyfus Foundation
10 Winding Lane
Greenwich, CT 06830
(203) 869-2240

Although in an early formative stage, these pilot efforts hold considerable promise for all parties concerned, including the postsecondary educators who enjoy added contact with applied mathematicians and renewed acquaintance with the pedagogical issues of the secondary classroom. Their commitment to overcoming the isolation of secondary science teachers is admirable and critical, as is their use of local resources. The key to continuation, as always, resides in the empowerment of the local teaching corps rather than the creation of more programmers, bureaucracies, or outside funders.

Appendix B

# Fiscal Resources

## National Endowment for the Humanities

The Division of Education Programs provides the principal means of fulfilling the Endowment's congressional mandate "to initiate and support . . . programs to strengthen . . . the teaching potential of the United States in the humanities . . ." The Endowment's grant programs are intended for elementary and secondary schools as well as institutions of higher education, including community colleges.

The program dealing with humanities instruction in elementary and secondary schools is designed to help schools and individual teachers strengthen their teaching of the humanities through programs of study and projects involving collaboration among teachers at the elementary, middle school, or secondary level and between school and university faculty. A collaborative project may involve many schools and colleges throughout a region of the country, or a single school or school system working with a local college. Contact:

Pamela Menke
Director, Division of Education Programs
MS202
National Endowment for the Humanities
Washington, DC 20506

State-based committees on the humanities have also provided support for collaborative activities between school and college faculty in English, history, and foreign languages. For further information, contact the appropriate executive directors in each state.

## The Rockefeller Foundation

The Rockefeller Foundation provides funding for projects that offer professional development opportunities for faculty representing all academic sectors and specialties within major disciplines from grade school through postsecondary levels. The Foundation concentrates its activities on fields of fundamental importance to mankind, such as arts and humanities. Contact:

Alberta Arthurs
Director for Arts and Humanities
The Rockefeller Foundation
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

## Exxon Education Foundation

The Exxon Education Foundation provides aid to higher education through programs in the areas of general education innovations in teaching and learning, and economic research and management of higher education. A special interest exists in projects that cross traditional lines between disciplines, professions, and institutions, and in projects that promote interaction between humanists. Priority is given to projects involving re-examination of basic educational purposes and programs. Contact:

Arnold Shore
Senior Advisor
Exxon Education Foundation
111 W. 49th Street
New York, NY 10020

## The Ford Foundation

The Ford Foundation's Urban Poverty Program supports efforts to create models of professional development for teachers of mathematics (soon to expand to other disciplines) in urban high schools. The projects are community-based and use the collaborative efforts of the public school district, science museums, colleges, universities, community colleges, and local business and industry. Contact:

Barbara Nelson
Urban Poverty Program
The Ford Foundation
320 E. 43rd Street
New York, NY 10017

## National Science Foundation

The National Science Foundation's Science and Mathematics Education Networks Program encourages the development of local and regional resource-sharing networks and collaborations that may include teachers, schools, local and state education agencies, colleges and universities, business and industry, and cultural and professional organizations. The networks provide opportunities for teachers and school administrators to learn about new classroom teaching techniques, new instructional material, and recent research findings. They also provide participants with professional support by introducing them to new teaching techniques. Contact:

Science and Mathematics Education
Networks Program
Division of Teacher Enhancement and
Informal Science Education
Directorate for Science and Engineering
Education
National Science Foundation
Washington, DC 20550

## Appendix C

# Bibliography


Amarel, Marianne, et al. "The Arts and Humanities in America's Schools." *Daedalus*, Summer, 1983.

American Association for Higher Education. Marc S. Tucker, ed. "Computers on Campus: Working Papers." *Current Issues in Higher Education* 2, 1983-1984.

Bellah, Robert N, et al. *Habits of the Heart*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985.

Bennett, William J. *To Reclaim A Legacy*. Washington: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1984.

Boyer, Ernest. *High School*. New York: Harper & Row, 1983.

Brann, Eva T.H. *Paradoxes of Education in A Republic*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

California Commission on the Teaching Profession. *Who Will Teach Our Children?* Sacramento: California Commission on the Teaching Profession, Nov. 1985.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. "The Faculty: Deeply Troubled." *Change* Trendlines Sept/Oct 1985.

Cleveland, Harlan. *The Knowledge Executive*. New York: E.P. Puttnam, 1985.

The College Board. *Teaching in America: The Common Ground*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1984.

*The Condition of Education*. 1985 Edition A Statistical Report, Washington: D.C. National Center for Educational Statistics.

Delattre, Edwin. "The Intellectual Lives of Teachers." *Against Mediocrity* Chester, Finn, Diane Ravitch, and Robert Fancher, (eds) New York: Holme's & Meier, 1984. pp.154-162.

Ford Foundation. "Math Collaboratives for Urban Teachers." *Ford Foundation Letter*, Volume 16, No. 2. April, 1985.

Gaudiani, Claire and Clara Krug. "A House No Longer Divided: Faculty Collaboration Across Educational Sectors." *Ram's Horn* Volume 2, Winter-Spring, 1983.

Gaudiani, Claire. "Defending the Humanities." *Change* January/February 1985.

———. "Local Communities of Inquiry: Penn's Academic Alliance Program." *College-School Collaboration: Appraising the Major Approach*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 24th ser. (December, 1986), pp. 69-78.

Gifford, B. R. "Teaching - from Occupation to Profession." *New England Journal of Public Policy* Summer/Fall 1985, pp 1-15.

Goodlad, John. *A Place Called School* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983.

newpage Grant, W. Vance & Thomas D. Snyder. Digest of Educational Statistics 1983-84 Washington: National Center for Educational Statistics.

Haley, Margaret A. "Why Teachers Should Organize." NEA Addresses - 1904 Proceedings, Volume 44 Asbury Park, NJ.

Healey, Timothy. "High Schools on the Brink." *New York Times Book Review* May 13, 1985.

Holton, G. (et.al.) *Daedalus* Volume 112, no. 4, Fall 1984.

Hurd, Paul De Hart. "Perspectives for the Reform of Science Education." *Phi Delta Kappan* January 1986, pp. 351-358.

Jacobson, Robert L. "New Carnegie Data Show Faculty Members Uneasy About the State of Academe and Their Own Careers." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* Dec. 18, 1985.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. "Changing the Shape of Work: Reform in Academe." *Current Issues in Higher Education 1*, Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.

Keller, George. *Academic Strategy*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 1983.

Maeroff, Gene I. *School and College: partnerships in education*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1983.

Naisbitt, I. (et.al.) *Reinventing the Corporation*. New York: Warner Books, 1985, Chapter 1.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. Washington: National Commission on Excellence 1983.

NEA Addresses: 1894 Proceedings, Volume 33. Asbury Park, NJ

Newman, Frank. *Higher Education and the American Resurgence*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1985.

Ravitch, Diane. *The Schools We Deserve*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1985.

Shanker, Albert. "Where We Stand: More on the California Report/Expanded Role for Teacher Unions." *New York Times* Nov. 19, 1985.

Shaw, Robert. "Collaboration for Colleagueship: A Program in Support of Teachers." *Education Leadership* Feb. 1983.

Shils, Edward. *The Academic Ethic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

———. *The Constitution of Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

———. *Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Sizer, Theodore. *Horace's Compromise*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1984.

Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. Involvement in Learning: *Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education*. Washington: U.S. Department of Education Oct. 1984.

Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Elementary Education and Secondary Education Policy. *Making the Grade*. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund 1983.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

## Current Issues in Higher Education

Soft-cover monographs of the collected best papers on selected issues. Most of the 1978-1983 series are based on papers presented at AAHE National Conferences on Higher Education.

Prices indicated include book rate postage and handling. Allow 2-3 weeks for delivery. Extra postage will be charged as required for special handling. 25 or more copies of a single title may be purchased at a 25% discount.

### 1985-86

1. **Academic Alliances: A New Approach to High School/ College Collaboration** — *By Claire L. Gaudiani and David G. Burnett* $5.00 ppd

### 1983-84 Complete Set: $14.00 ppd

1. **Colleges Enter the Information Society** — *Essays by Russell Edgerton, Louis Robinson, George Gerbner, Ithiel de Sola Pool, Patricia Battin, Steven Muller* $4.60 ppd
2. **Computers on Campus: Working Papers** — *Edited by Marc S. Tucker* $3.50 ppd (available in photocopy only)
3. **Writing Across the Curriculum** — *Essays by Barbara Leigh Smith, Maxine Hairston, Joan Graham, Christopher Rideout, Charles A. Bergman* $3.50 ppd (available in photocopy only)
4. **Vitality Without Mobility: The Faculty Opportunities Audit** — *By Clara M. Lovett with the assistance of Lloyd J. Averill, Roger Baldwin, Russell Edgerton, and the AAHE Task Force on Professional Growth* $3.50 (available in photocopy only)

### 1982-83 Complete Set: $5.75 ppd

1. **Underprepared Learners** — *Essays by K. Patricia Cross, Darrell A. Clowes, Robert H. McCabe, Martin Trow* $3.50 ppd (available in photocopy only)
2. **Liberal Learning and Career Preparation** — *Essays by Mary Ann F. Rehnke, W. Ed Whitelaw, H. Bradley Sagen, John J. Agria, David R. Hiley* $4.60 ppd

### 1981 Available only as a complete set: $15.00 ppd

1. **High School/College Partnerships**
2. **Creating an Integrated Curriculum: The "Higher" in Higher Education**
3. **Partnerships with Business and the Professions**
4. **Part-Time Faculty in Colleges and Universities**
5. **New Technologies for Higher Education**

### 1980 Available only as a complete set: $13.00 ppd

1. **Improving Teaching and Institutional Quality**
2. **Funding Quality Improvement: Lessons from the FIPSE Experience**
3. **Differing Perspectives on Declining Faculty Salaries (photocopy only)**
4. **New Models for General Education**
5. **Integrating Adult Development Theory with Higher Education Practice**
6. **Strategies for Retrenchment: National, State, Institutional**

### 1979 Available only as a complete set: $13.00 ppd

1. **Perspectives on Leadership**
2. **Faculty Career Development**
3. **Premises of Federal Student Assistance**
4. **Employment Priorities in Academe**
5. **Assessment**
6. **Tenure**
7. **The Academic Workforce: Opportunities for Renewal**

### 1978 Available only as a complete set: $14.50 ppd

1. **Adapting Institutions to the Adult Learner: Experiments in Progress**
2. **The Adult Learner**
3. **Beyond *Bakke*: The Unfinished Agenda in Admissions**
4. **Changing Retirement Policies**
5. **The Changing Shape of Work: Psychosocial Trends in America**
6. **Higher Education Resurgence or Decline?**
7. **New Directions for the Student Consumer Movement**
8. **New Findings on the Effects of College**
9. **Next Steps Toward Lifelong Learning: Views from Three National Projects**
10. **What Shall We Do About Declining Test Scores?**
11. **The Women's Movement: Impact on the Campus and Curriculum**